

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings replaces the sheet of drawings previously submitted.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet 1/1

REMARKS

The Examiner objected to the specification and drawings; rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Langfahl (U.S. Patent No. 6,031,528).

Applicant amends the specification and drawings.

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application.

Objection to the Specification and Drawings

The Examiner objected to the specification and drawings on the ground that figures should be designated with numerical labels, i.e., Figure 1, etc.

Accordingly, Applicant amends the specification and drawings by replacing “the Figure” with “Figure 1,” and thus requests that the objection be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-16 as being unpatentable over Langfahl. Applicant traverses.

Regarding claim 1, Langfahl does not describe “modifying the visual network plan . . . according to hardware and/or software existing in the protocol tester.” The Examiner writes that Langfahl’s visual network plan is modified according to hardware and/or software “existing in the system.” The Examiner’s assertion may be true but it misses claim 1’s language: “existing in the protocol tester.” That is, Langfahl’s visual network plan is modified according to devices on network map 30 (“the system”), e.g., DNS server 24 and Gateway 23 (column 3, lines 15-36)—not hardware and/or software “existing in” User PC 20 (Langfahl’s “protocol tester”). Langfahl cannot satisfy the language of claim 1 because the DNS server and Gateway do not “exist in” the User PC—they are certainly outside of it. One of ordinary skill in the art of protocol analysis would understand claim 1’s “hardware and/or software existing in the protocol tester” to mean network cards, interfaces, and configured protocol stacks, as discussed in Applicant’s specification at page 7, lines 19-22. Langfahl teaches no such thing. For this reason, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Langfahl. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 2-16 are allowable because they depend from claim 1, which is allowable for the reason discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 2-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, allowance of claims 1-16 is urged, and such action and the issuance of this case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Christian Schoenfeld

By: Michael A. Nelson/

Michael A. Nelson
Reg. No. 59,450
(503) 627-1785 (Voice)
(503) 627-7119 (Fax)

December 18, 2007

Tektronix, Inc.
P.O. Box 500
Delivery Station 50-LAW
Beaverton, OR 9707